UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Emerson and Thoreau - *Leonard B. Gray*

No Pattern of Panic for America - - - - - - - - *Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.*

What Should the Layman Expect of His Minister in These Times? - *J. Ray Shute*

Francis Ellingwood Abbot - - - - - - - - - - *Gardner Williams*

Western Conference News

VOLUME CXXXVII NUMBER 6

Chicago, January-February, 1952

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Edwin T. Buehrer: Minister of The Third Unitarian Church of Chicago.

Sylvanus M. Duvall: Professor in George Williams College, Chicago.

Leonard B. Gray: Minister of the Second Congregational Church, East Douglas, Massachusetts.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

J. Ray Shute: Editorial writer, *The Christian Register.*

Gardner Williams: Professor in the University of Toledo.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 87

ARTICLES—

Emerson and Thoreau—LEONARD B. GRAY 88

No Pattern of Panic for America—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 92

What Should the Layman Expect of His Minister in These Times?—J. RAY SHUTE 94

Francis Ellingwood Abbot (1836-1903)—GARDNER WILLIAMS ... 97

THE STUDY TABLE—

Human Hope Still Deferred—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 98

A Valuable Source Book—SYLVANUS M. DUVALL 98

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 99

THE FIELD—

Japan Goes in for English—*Worldover Press* 86

THE FIELD

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Japan Goes in for English

By Tetsuichi Kurashige

Postwar Japan feels the need of learning English far more than foreigners coming here find it desirable to study Japanese. It is a big change from days before the war, when even a Japanese official able to speak English often sought to uphold his dignity by using an interpreter and conversing in Japanese. During the war, strait-jacketed nationalism ran so high that the use of all foreign languages, except those of the Axis allies, was frowned on. English was singled out as the "enemy language." No one could read a foreign publication openly without the risk of being molested by hot-headed "patriots."

For practical purposes, English has now become the second language in Japan. During the occupation it has been almost a necessity, for the innumerable conferences between occupation officials and Japanese. Besides, all correspondence addressed to SCAP had to be in English. Private business negotiations between foreign traders and Japanese merchants are conducted in English. The use of interpreters was found to be time-consuming, and often led to misunderstandings.

Certain idiomatic or colloquial expressions in English, however, simply baffle the Japanese. The expression "match-maker," meaning a go-between in arranging a marriage, appeared in a novel, and was translated: "A person who manufactures match." When confronted with the term, "thinking aloud," one Japanese challenged it. "How can you think aloud? Thinking is always done in silence!"

There is a chronic confusion over the use of "yes" and "no." When a Japanese is asked in his own language, "This doesn't belong to you, does it?," and the correct answer happens to be negative, he replies "Yes" (it doesn't belong to me).

Japanese agree that English as spoken by an Englishman is easier to understand than that uttered by an American. They say that Americans talk too fast, that some of them mumble or "nasalize" their words! It would be unfair to put all Americans in this category. The New

(*Continued on page* 96)

UNITY

Volume CXXXVII JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1952 No. 6

EDITORIAL

The Unitarians and the Universalists have been flirting with each other for a generation. Finally it appeared that a complete union, at least for the time being, was not feasible. So a representative joint commission of the two denominations came up with a plan for gradual steps toward a federal union. The general idea was approved by both denominations. And now begins the slow process of learning to work together in limited fields. It is thought that in Publications and in Religious Education a fruitful beginning may be made. All liberals will wish this process the greatest possible success. But it will do no good to ignore the problems involved. Fortunately, doctrinal matters are not among the major problems, if in fact they constitute any problem at all. Both denominations are free of creedal tests, and both denominations contain a great variety of theological opinions ranging from right-wing Theism to left-wing Humanism. And while it cannot be said that either denomination is free of theological bias, it can be said that both are remarkably free of theological dogmatism. Nevertheless there are difficult problems involved. Chief among them is the natural, proper, and laudable pride that each takes in its own name. History has loaded the name Unitarian with meanings and sentiments that are precious and that are not to be lightly disregarded. This is also true of the name Universalist. Both names have bone and sinew in their makeup. And neither is likely to be discarded in favor of the dubious term liberal or the still more dubious term Free Church. Still another set of problems revolves around physical properties and endowments, and these cannot be resolved merely by calling them "vested interests." The intricate legal matters involved are numerous and are not to be treated lightly. Legal actions could tie up a proposed merger for a generation. Also the merger of auxiliary agencies presents peculiar problems. Let the movement toward federal union proceed with caution, as it is doing, and much good may be accomplished. Already we use the same Hymn Book. There is much common use of religious education materials. Ministers pass back and forth with a minimum of difficulty. The Service Committees of the two denominations work together amicably. At the local level there is an increasing number of church mergers. Small, non-administrative regional conferences could well unite their efforts. Local ministerial groups should include both Universalists and Unitarians. Summer Institutes could be profitably merged. National Conferences could meet simultaneously in the same city, with educational and inspirational programs in common. New churches could be started as joint projects. Theological Schools could educate ministers for both denominations, as indeed they are now doing to a considerable extent. In these and other similar ways the two denominations can move closer together. But it would be a grave mistake to attempt to ditch centuries of prideful history associated with the development of the Unitarian idea—and with the name Unitarian. And no doubt Universalists have a similar feeling toward their history, their central idea, and the inclusive name—Universalist. There will be no fusion and no immediate federal union, but closer cooperation there can and should be.

Curtis W. Reese.

Emerson and Thoreau

LEONARD B. GRAY

Of the people who were acquainted with both Emerson and Thoreau or with their writings when the latter died in 1862 at the age of forty-five few, if any, questioned that the former, fifty-nine years of age, was the greater of the two men. At that time the older man had been forgiven in a large measure for the radicalism of his youth by the good people of Concord and was generally accepted and respected by them as a solid and substantial citizen. Many people throughout the English-speaking world and in some countries beyond considered him America's foremost man of letters. The younger man was still looked upon as a radical, an eccentric, and a useless idler by more than a few of the townspeople. They did not like his bold independence, his anti-social ways, and his severe criticism of their modes of thinking and living. They had not forgotten that he had been put in jail for not paying his taxes. They had not forgiven him for setting a fire in the woods which had destroyed considerable property.

Emerson was widely known as a highly successful lecturer; Thoreau as almost a complete failure by the few audiences that had heard him. Many thoughtful persons read the former, few read the latter. To be sure, the younger man was not without friends and admirers. His genius and integrity were recognized by Emerson and a few other intellectuals. In Concord and surrounding towns his superb abilities as surveyor and pencil-maker were well known. His splendid services for the town's Lyceum were greatly appreciated. Indeed, "the Concord Sage," as Emerson was called, and a few other admirers were enthusiastic about him. But generally he was misunderstood and mistrusted and most of the weight of the small public that knew him or knew of him was against him.

It was this way with these two great contemporaries at the time of Thoreau's death. During the remaining twenty years of Emerson's life, and for a considerable time after his death, the opinions that people held of the two men and of their literary merits remained relatively about the same as they were the day Thoreau died. But around the beginning of this century Thoreau's fame began a gradual increase and during the last twenty-five years or so it has risen rapidly. Today not a few people regard Thoreau a greater writer than Emerson. Certainly the former's star in recent years has risen faster than the latter's. In fact, some claim that the latter's star is sinking. Those who study trends in American literature have found that from 1940 to 1950 research articles on Thoreau have increased three hundred per cent over the preceding decade, while such articles on Emerson have decreased a bit during these years. *Walden* appears on the Reading Lists that colleges recommend but none of Emerson's works appears on these lists. But the change in the relative positions of these two writers, some maintain, is not due to Thoreau's superiority *but rather* to the fact that the world has been much slower in recognizing the merits of the author of *Walden* than those of the man who was called "The Sage of Concord" before he died. Which of the two men is the greater? Speakers and writers argue this question with increasing heat, and arguing about the matter has been one of my favorite pastimes. Generally I have given the laurels to Emerson but recently I have been persuaded a bit toward the younger of Concord's two great independents. My opinion on this matter, however, is not important. It is really a minor and ungracious question that we cannot decide and that would not do us any good if we could. It is best to rejoice in the greatness of both men and to appreciate the distinctive qualities and contributions of each.

Since authors that posterity calls great appear but seldom, not many communities have had the honor of producing one such writer and fewer still of giving history more than one at the same time. What a phenomenon then that little Concord should produce out of its two thousand people three such great contemporaries as Emerson and Thoreau and Louisa May Alcott, and that Hawthorne, likely America's greatest novelist, should live in their town for a number of years while they did! No other community has had this distinction.

Boston was the city where Ralph Waldo Emerson was born. Unitarian had been his long family background and his father was a Unitarian minister. Natural then for young Waldo to proceed to Unitarian Harvard College, a few years of teaching, and theological studies were the steps he took, in order, to the famous Second Church in Boston which he served as assistant minister and then as minister. He resigned the pastorate of this church in 1832, it is often said, because of his unwillingness to administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But this unwillingness on his part, I think, simply hastened the break with the church that he would have made sooner or later anyway. Temperamentally and intellectually he was unfitted for the ministry. He was ill at ease in conducting funerals. He hated official goodness. He often felt, and said at least once, that the better part of a man rebelled at being a minister.

Ill health, great mental unrest, and desire to see some of his favorite authors sent him on a visit to Europe. He met and talked with Wordsworth, Coleridge, Landor, and Carlyle, chiefly Carlyle, I should say. That day he found the rugged and tumultuous Scotsman among the wild and lonely hills of Craigenputtock, after a long horse-and-buggy ride from Edinburgh, was one of the great days in Emerson's life and perhaps in Carlyle's. As the stormy Scot argued and pounded the table and the gentle young American smiled and listened late into the night, the two men started one of the truest and longest friendships in all history. Years later Jane Carlyle was to write to Emerson, "Friend, who years ago, in the Desert, descended on us, out of the clouds, as it were, and made one day there look like enchantment to us, and left us weeping that it was only one day."

Returning home restored in health and spirits and with a determination to urge Americans to throw off their cultural bondage to Europe, young Emerson settled in Concord on an income of $1,200 a year from his first wife. He soon resumed preaching and supplied various pulpits but declined the few calls extended to him to become minister. More and more,

he found that he liked the greater freedom and humanness of the lecture platform. The Lyceums were flourishing and they were calling him to address them. So were the colleges. At such places, he began to decide, he would find his pulpit. Soon he married Lydia Jackson of Plymouth, became a landowner and family man, and began by his lectures and books to send throughout the world a light of influence that would do much to make his little town one of the great intellectual centers of all time.

At twenty Henry Thoreau graduated from Harvard and showed his independence by declining a diploma on the grounds that he thought it not worth the customary fee of five dollars. His beloved Concord became his universe for the rest of his short life. Away from it long he was homesick. Every other place was an unnatural environment for him, he felt. I love no sentence by him better than this, "I have never got over my surprise that I should have been born into the most estimable place in all the world, and in the very nick of time too." He probably gave up the opportunity to make a fortune by refusing offers to make and sell pencils. Finding teaching irksome he gave it up after a few years of it in Staten Island, New York, and in Concord. Thereafter he made his living by working at surveying and other odd jobs about six weeks a year. The rest of the time he said he wanted to live and "drive life into a corner" to see if he could get his hands on it. While many called him a man of leisure and an idler, he considered sauntering through the woods and fields and thinking too important to waste his time at the occupations of most men.

The writings of some men seem much greater than themselves, but Emerson was as great as anything he ever wrote, if not greater. Purely in himself he was one of the greatest and loveliest men that ever walked this earth. "A saint with a twinkle in his eye," as some one said and many thought, was one way of describing his wonderful combination of saintliness and humanity. His gentle firmness made him a lovable and a strong man. Strangers when they first met him felt something intangible and indescribable, almost godlike, about him. Not a few persons felt when they heard or met him that he was the greatest man they had ever known. A few hours in his presence actually changed some people completely. Many people, including Thoreau for a time, were unconsciously moved to imitate Emerson's mannerisms and way of speaking. His tall figure was almost handsome although without the classic beauty of Hawthorne. Almost unequaled was the effect of the hushed, ineffable, self-contained calmness about him! How piercing and searching his eyes at times! How impressive and unforgettable the spell of his melodious voice with its rich cadences that moved Alexander Ireland of Edinburgh to say, "The sweetest, the most winning and penetrating of any I have ever heard"! An old washerwoman said that she loved to look at him and hear him lecture even though she could not understand him. Seldom, if ever, was there a man so magnanimous, so devoid of selfishness, egotism, and jealousy. Unlike Thoreau, how slow to condemn and quick to praise others he was! No wonder not a few persons who hated Emerson's ideas admired and loved Emerson.

Emerson was primarily a young man's man. Even Thoreau with his grudgingly given praise said this. While elderly people were a bit suspicious of the ex-minister and could not forget that he was too liberal for his great Boston pulpit, young men worshipped him. His remarkable personality, his startling and adventurous thinking, and his virility of spirit drew the most intelligent and thoughtful of them like a magnet. Even to the last years of his life he retained a strong hold on youth. It must have been the freshness of his mind and that indefinable something in the man that did this, for there was very little personal warmth about him. He was, as he often admitted, a bit cold. While he freely gave intellectually and spiritually, especially through lecturing, he could not easily get over to people any emotional depths which some thought he did not possess. He was not an excellent conversationalist. He seldom laughed. He did not joke. When he smiled he closed his eyes. Inhibited, psychologists today would call him. We cannot quite explain the spell of his intangible influence but not a few people testified that it was extraordinary.

What a contrast in appearance was the short, firmly-knit Thoreau to the tall Emerson with his sloping shoulders! Light was the younger man's complexion, serious his blue eyes, and grim his facial expression save when relieved by a smile of wonderful sweetness.

Both these Concord writers wrote much about solitude, but only Thoreau loved long periods of it. The older was chiefly a man of the study and home and lecture platform; the younger chiefly a man of the woods and fields in which he was an active, nervous walker of great endurance. Indeed, the latter was a skilled woodsman with the trained sense of an Indian, with eyes that saw in the night, and a way of feeling his path in the densest darkness. His friends knew that he could make good his claims that he could tell to a day when each flower should bloom and guide a person to the very spot where he had heard a partridge fly in the dark of dawn the day before.

For the young Thoreau what great years were those first few after his graduation from Harvard! Like many other young men he was completely bowled over and won by Emerson's wonderful personality, independent thinking, and fascinating lecturing. Thoreau once told Moncure Conway that he found in Emerson "a world where truths existed with the same perfection as the objects he studied in external nature, his ideas, real and exact as antennae and stamina."

While Thoreau's earlier writings did not do much more than copy and repeat Emerson's, even more remarkable was the enthusiasm of the older man for the younger. Indeed, Emerson seemed to have imagined Thoreau before he met him. The former for a long time had been looking for a man who would make a new study of nature in relation to man. At last he had found his man. The man fourteen years his junior would be a new eye and ear toward nature for him. In this he was certainly right. Thoreau making his less observing companion notice for the first time the common mountain laurel that grew in Concord was only one of the many ways that the younger man opened the book of nature to the older.

But chiefly Emerson had the pride of the Master winning a disciple. The disciple would promote his ideas, he evidently thought. Of Thoreau he wrote, "I am familiar with his thoughts, they are mine quite originally dressed." Possessively the older man would say, "My Henry," "My good Henry," and "My

valiant Henry." All this was a bit unpardonable in the man who said that it was his business to make other men unlike himself. I hardly like it, and Thoreau soon began to resent this patronizing, possessive manner of the great man.

Thoreau was Emerson's disciple but only for a short time. The peculiar bent in the genius of the younger independent was soon to hear a different drummer and to march in a different parade. It was to make him much more of a scientist and realist and practical man than the Seer. What in the wide world made Charles J. Woodbury write such an untrue thing as this, "Emerson made Thoreau; he was a child of Emerson's, as if of his own flesh"? The truth is that the older man inspired the younger, but did not make him. He started Thoreau's motor going only to find it running in its own way. The genius that was not awakened until Emerson touched it was to go a different way from that of the man who awoke it. Thoreau was thoroughly Thoreau. He was not another Emerson, nor any other man.

Look at the relationships to Concord of these two great contemporaries! Thoreau was born in the town and grew out of its soil and culture. Emerson chose it as a very attractive and congenial place to live and to study, and as a convenient center from which to exercise a wide influence. Concord was the whole world in miniature to Thoreau, and almost everything he knew about the world he saw in or related to his beloved little town. Certainly he was much more indigenous there than Boston-born and reared Emerson. Most of the things the Sage of Concord wrote could have been written in many other places, but one simply cannot imagine Thoreau's writings, except a few, being written any place but Concord. Emerson travelled over much of the world and was frequently away from Concord. Thoreau's trips and periods of residence away from his native town were few and short. Thoreau loved both the companionship and the minute study of the natural world, Emerson only the companionship of it. The Sage was more of an onlooker at the life he wrote about; the saunterer and manual worker more of a liver of the life he wrote about. The former could write and lecture eloquently about solitude and the value of living close to nature, but he never loved long hours of solitude like the latter, and he became bored if he did not see his beloved Boston and Saturday Club in Boston fairly frequently. "Leave me alone a few days," he once wrote, "and I creep about as if in expectation of a calamity." We heartily agree with what Emerson wrote about the great values of manual labor, but we smile a bit at his writing, "There is virtue yet in the hoe and spade for learned as well as unlearned hands," knowing that his learned hands got more blisters and aches than virtues from the hoe and spade. He ranged wider in travel and in thought than Thoreau, while the latter concentrated more on a small cross-section of life. Hence, the latter's connection with realities was more intimate and intense than Emerson's and the relationship between his living and his writing closer than what we find in the older man's. There is certainly more of a personal element in Thoreau's books than in Emerson's and perhaps also a stronger ring of reality. There is more Thoreau in Thoreau's writings than Emerson in Emerson's writings. Here, then, is something in favor of the younger writer if, as some claim, it is chiefly the personal element that gives literature enduring value.

On the other hand there is a lot to be said for Emerson's greater universality. Emerson remains the most universal mind in American history, many claim.

In daily living in Concord, Thoreau was never a complete hermit, not even during his two years at Walden Pond. He liked the village gossip if he did not get too much of it. Among both the intellectuals and the unlearned he occasionally found congenial company. He loved children and they loved him. Some one spoke for not a few older people when he said that he liked Henry but could not love him and would rather take the arm of a tree than the arm of the man. Thoreau did not join as many societies in the town as Emerson did. In general the latter liked people better and was more tolerant toward cranks and other unpleasant claimants of his time.

Thoreau was revolutionary both in his thinking and in his manner of living, Emerson only in his thinking. While the latter startled his audiences and readers by unconventional and daring thoughts, he was a fairly conventional family man and citizen. But he was too reserved, too much of the time away from home, and too famous to win easily a warm place in the hearts of the townspeople. He noticed with regret that his fame stopped the conversation in grocery store and postoffice. And yet gradually through the years Concord's famous citizen broke down the barriers between him and the Concordians. More and more, it was noticed he relaxed his aloofness and stopped to talk to the people, even the children, on the street. He joined the Social Club made up of the village's twenty-five leading citizens and regularly attended its Tuesday evening meetings. He became a member of the School Board. He joined the Fire Association and as the world-famous intellectual vigorously attacked forest blazes with green boughs he probably won both the humourous smiles and the kindly feelings of his fellow-firemen. Increasingly the great lecturer and essayist became humanized and Concord-minded. Increasingly he came to be regarded as something more than a speaker at special occasions. Increasingly the citizens of the town admired their Olympian and became more proud of his world fame than they were perhaps willing to admit. The time just had to come when their growing admiration and affection would burst forth like a flood, and that day came in 1873 when Emerson returned from a trip abroad. Pent-up emotions broke out in the large turning-out of people to give him an enthusiastic reception at the station and in their escorting him with a band to the house restored for him in his absence by affectionate friends. That reception, I think, meant more to the Sage than all the adoration and praise he had received throughout America and abroad. At the gate the great man was completely overcome. At long last he was a prophet with honor in his home town. At seventy he had come into his own in his dear, little Concord which he loved, I believe, best of all places in the world. That night the great intellect was all heart, and at one with his village's tradespeople and farmers. Concord and Emerson, after all, had warm hearts. There is nothing finer in all the world than the deep heart of a New England village when it thaws out. Who can think of all this without tears, at least in his heart? Late that night when it was all over and the tired, happy man had retired, Mrs. Emerson wrote to a friend of her husband, "If there is a lighter-hearted man in all the world, I don't know where he lives."

But alas! Poor Thoreau never won such a warm place in the hearts of his fellow-citizens. He had been colder and more aloof than Emerson. He did not have the older man's gracious way of expressing his views. He could not come back home with the mantle of world fame wrapped about him. Had he lived to a ripe old age not likely could he have received the reception that his great contemporary did that night. Would that Concord's greatest independent could know that the Thoreau Society of America a few years ago received considerable support throughout the country in its efforts to get a place for him in the Hall of Fame. History does strange things to the reputations of men, claimed Emerson.

While the older independent was certainly a genuine man who held in the main to his early resolve "Not to utter any speech, poem or book that is not entirely and peculiarly my work," he did like the standards of worldly success better and he did trim his sails to the public taste a bit more than the younger. Thoreau was always more thoroughly Thoreau, it seems, than Emerson was Emerson. It would set all right with me to detect in his journal on February 9, 1838, Emerson's pride in his net profit of $568 from his ten lectures given that winter at the Masonic Temple, Boston, and in the fact that the average attendance at the lectures was 439 persons, if I had not read these sentences, "Our religion vulgarly stands on numbers of believers. Whenever the appeal is made—no matter how indirectly—to numbers, proclamation is then and there made that religion is not," in his essay *The Over-Soul.* But perhaps we had better excuse him for this, since in *Self-Reliance* he wrote, "A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds."

I endorse Emerson's pains to adapt himself to his particular audience. After his invasion of the West as a lecturer in September, 1848, a great change took place in his style and content. Illustrations and anecdotes appeared in his lectures that do not appear in the written forms of the same lectures. About that time he wrote, "It is necessary that you should know the people's facts. If you have no place for them the people absolutely have no place for you." Thoreau's persistent refusal to adapt himself to an audience in this way was likely the main reason for his almost complete failure as a lecturer. This difference in the attitudes of the two men toward the public mind of their day moves some people to say that Emerson had more ability to speak to his age, but not to the ages.

Why has this independent, stubborn Thoreau who never went against his personal tastes to please anyone got something that mankind cannot get away from? Why is he increasingly timely today? I doubt that the main reason is his power over words, although this power is greater than Emerson's, and perhaps insurpassable, to kick and prod and provoke the mind of the reader. It is now clear that admiring friends in his day were wrong in saying that he would live as a poet-naturalist. They would be surprised to learn that his favorite subject, the correspondence between man and nature, accounts largely for his timeliness today. This keen observer of nature and of men wrote against the "quiet desperation" that people in his day suffered amid the pressures, trappings, and chains of a demanding society. But the strain put on men by our higher-pressured society is much greater today. It is more difficult just now than ever before for people to disentangle themselves from the encumbrances of life. "Quiet desperations," I believe, are increasing. Suppression of instinctive desires through conformity to a conventional standard of worldly success, psychologists claim, causes disastrous effects upon personality. Trapped, suppressed, and hurt by conventions and by their unnatural living, more people are coming to understand—even though the majority probably do not—that man's dependence upon his natural environment for health of body and mind is older and greater than his need of gadgets. The failure of material success to produce contentment and happiness is causing an increasing number of people to doubt the worth of the values they live for. Such conditions of living and thinking are the main reasons, I strongly believe, for interest in Thoreau's books and values rising rapidly to its all-time high.

The reading of this writer has actually induced some men to adopt to some extent his way of life. His *Civil Disobedience* did much to inspire Gandhi's civil disobedience in India. *Walden,* read to him in early youth by his father, inspired the great poet William Butler Yeats to seek his island paradise of Innisfree where he could live alone and seek wisdom. Reading *Walden* while at Cornell University several years ago started a wealthy young Jew on a type of thinking that a few years later induced him to get a job on a dairy farm in Vermont instead of pursuing his ambition to be a prosperous businessman. But like Thoreau himself we do not urge his way of living so much as his values. It is chiefly his set of values that makes him great and immortal. His living at Walden Pond is not so important as what he thought and wrote at Walden Pond.

Emerson, because he lived in no unusual way and advocated no particular way, has probably started not so many people in definite ways of living as Thoreau has. The Sage of Concord is chiefly an inspirer of men. He leads our thinking more than our steps into new paths. He still makes people boil as he once did young Thoreau and young Whitman. He makes us hot and sets the motors of our minds going. Years ago a seventeen-year-old girl was made so hot by listening to her father read *Self-Reliance* that she had to go out for a walk to cool off. Emerson still does this sort of thing.

His close association with Emerson and his penetrating insight probably enabled Thoreau to see the Sage's limitations better than any one else. Like the writer, he considered inability to appreciate Hawthorne and Hawthorne's novels and dislike for all sad and gloomy literature, however great, "blind spots" in Emerson's makeup. The younger independent, it seems clear, was sickened a bit at times by the patronizing manner of the Seer, while the latter occasionally resented the stubbornness of "my good Henry." But despite a few slight estrangements between the two men, real affection for each other lasted for the twenty-five years of their close association. Henry "with difficulty, sweet" often worked, not exactly as a hired man, at his friend's house and took care of it and the garden during Emerson's long absence in Europe. The two men liked the companionship of each other, especially on long walks through the fields and woods. Thoreau, I believe, could not quite throw off the influence of the man who had set him on fire and made him an avowed disciple when he was just out of Harvard. Emerson probably had a warmer feeling for his one-time disciple

than for any other man with the possible exception of Carlyle. Tender and moving was an incident that Mrs. Alexander Gilchrist, a friend of Walt Whitman, observed in Emerson's home in the Fall of 1878. With the present becoming dim to him, the great man dwelt more happily in his glorious past. "What was the name of my best friend?" he asked. "Henry Thoreau," his wife answered. "Oh yes, Henry Thoreau," Emerson replied.

Despite some marked differences in their abilities, modes of living, and dominant interests, the two men had much in common. They both loved the *Bhagavad-Gita* and often found a spiritual rebirth through reading this great Hindu literature. Both rebelled against the unnatural life of man and against many conventional beliefs and ways of living of their day. Both taught the divine worth of man. Both were transcendentalists believing that after sense-experience and reason had reached their last frontiers intuition could go much farther and find reality. Both urged people to live their own lives, not the lives of others. Both exhorted their fellows to have faith in themselves, to believe that they were greater than they knew, and to explore "the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" of their own beings.

The similarity in their essential teachings, even more than the fact that they lived in the same town at the same time, puts our two men inseparably together in the minds of men for posterity. The great Hawthorne lived in Concord at different times in their day and he was a friend of Thoreau, and yet we do not say "Thoreau and Hawthorne" nor "Emerson and Hawthorne," but rather "Emerson and Thoreau."

The changing conditions of living, needs, tastes, and man's ability to appreciate will likely continue to make the reputations of these two great contemporaries go up and down and change their relative places in the opinion of mankind even as they have done in the past. But amid all such fluctuations, the hold of these Concord thinkers on the mind of man will probably endure. Emerson and Thoreau Societies and the continual flow of visitors to Concord are only a few of the many indications of this high probability. Not a few people, although likely never the majority, will continue to read these two writers and to drink deeply from their springs of wisdom. Even the majority, I believe, will be influenced by the intellectual and spiritual climate that these two great minds will continue to create. Emerson and Thoreau belong together and to the ages.

No Pattern of Panic for America

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Mark Twain once said that Adam and Eve enjoyed many advantages, not the least of which was that they escaped teething. The United States has not been so fortunate. We are in the process of a teething period right now and, like any normal, healthy child, we are having our troubles with it. Whether we like it or not, we are being forced to cut our eyeteeth of world leadership by the flow of a destiny which stems from the very thing we are most proud of: our commanding position of wealth, production, energy, and enterprise. We are the number one power in the world. We like that. What we do not like are the inevitable responsibilities that go along with it. And yet, every time we shirk or bungle those responsibilities, we create a vacuum into which our nemesis is only too anxious to jump. In spite of all our desires not to be bothered with a world which is too complex and jittery for our natural tastes, we are at the same time very certain we do not want to see Russia with its Communist ideology inherit all the earth outside the continental limits of North and South America. So here we are, caught, as it were, between our childhood and our maturity, and we are making everything the psychologists say about that fretful period of life look like the gospel truth.

There were a few newspapers in Europe which noticed, even if many of our own did not, that there was something confusing about a people which could love Hoover's program in January and MacArthur's in April. How the same people could be for both, pulling all our strength within the "Gilbralter" of the Western Hemispere and at the same time aggressively risking full-scale war in the Far East, is puzzling to say the least. But there are countless ones among us who have favored both of these mutually exclusive programs with impartial fervor. On the surface at least this looks like neurotic behavior.

Further analysis, however, makes some sense of what to an outsider must appear to be a clear case of schizophrenia. If we remember that most of us in America are still in the teething stage of world leadership, the irritability which would first fasten itself to Hoover's proposals, only to be beaten off by logic and the ponderous weight of facts, would then quite logically turn with a howl of suppressed frustration to the proposals of MacArthur. After all, both of these proposals are opposed to what we are doing now—and what we are doing now, whether it is right or wrong, probably demands the greatest patience, tension-capacity, and maturity we Americans have ever been asked to deliver.

For a people who would basically like to be rid of their responsibilities in the world, the Hoover proposal looked like manna from heaven. The only trouble with it was that it meant making a free-will offering of a billion people to organized Soviet power. Even some of the bitterest among us came to see this, after a few months of what we chose to call the "Great Debate." But once having been frustrated in our wish to wash our hands of the whole blooming mess, we were suddenly confronted with another opportunity to whoop it up in a manner to which we had not been accustomed since VJ Day. The General came home. With his coming there flooded into our hearts the noble logic that if we could not rid ourselves of the slow, tortuous responsibilities of world leadership, then at least we could get the whole thing over with once and for all by forcing a showdown in Asia. Now I cannot truthfully say this is what General MacArthur is advocating, because he has a great gift for ambiguity. I am reasonably convinced, however, that this attitude of "Well, if we're going to have it eventually, let's get it over with now,"

prevails among the rank and file of the men and women who rally to the General's five-star banner. Again it is the reaction of people who are teething and do not like it. First you wish you could get rid of the painful process altogether. If you cannot do that, you then try to convince yourself there is some way to get the whole nasty business over with in a hurry. Now you cannot do that in teething, and you cannot do it in international affairs either. We could provoke a full-scale war. It may be forced on us whether we provoke it or not, but an American victory in World War III and a crushing defeat of the Soviet Union, rather than achieving the objectives of American foreign policy, would make those objectives far more distant and difficult than they are now.

The true objectives of American foreign policy are the objectives of all humane, enlightened, and broad-minded men and women everywhere. They were first given expression in the Old Testament vision of the prophet Micah. Their spiritual grandeur was affirmed in the Declaration of Independence. They grew to world-encompassing embodiment in the Charter and Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations.

It may be, as some insist, that we are still generations away from a planetary realization of these objectives. But if there is one thing which stands out above all else, as we consider the chances of the world's two and one-half billion people in the years ahead, it is the determining role which we as Americans will play. We are at the moment a tiny island of prosperity and material grandeur completely surrounded by poverty, misery, famine, and hostile envy. We have been immeasurably enriched by two World Wars, while most other peoples of the world have been impoverished and laid waste by them.

What is happening in Asia today has little to do with Communism. General MacArthur said that in the initial part of his speech to Congress—a part, incidentally, which seems to have little or no influence on the rest of what he has been saying.

Using an old technique of the novelists, you could conjure up a tomorrow morning in which the entire Soviet Union had vanished from the face of the earth, and do you think our troubles would be over in Asia, or Africa, or South America, or Eastern Europe? Not on your tintype. All those troubles would be there just as they are now, Russia or no Russia.

Above the smoke and fury and all the name-calling, let us remember one thing and let us remember it firmly. What is wrong with the world today is not the devil disguised as the Politburo. What is wrong with the world is poverty, sickness, hunger, misery, squalor. Except for the United States, Great Britain, and a few other isolated spots, the rest of the world is one great, massive slum. And the devil disguised as the Politburo knows very well indeed how to exploit that situation. In the tough arena of international power politics, the Kremlin gang is our immediate foe. The existence of a Kremlin gang, however, with its terrifying effectiveness, can only be possible in a world where hordes of people are driven to desperation by a grinding poverty which brutalizes their souls.

Throughout most of our history, we Americans have been able to express our noble ideals of political, social, and economic freedom without involving ourselves directly in the hard choices, vanity, brutishness, and ugly passions of international affairs. We have been able to talk of our high hopes for the people of all nations and races without tearing our flesh on the ragged edges of their irrational prejudices and passions. Suddenly all that is changed. History has plunged us into the very center of the whirlpool of international life. We had no idea how vexing and frustrating and complicated it could be.

We have always held a very high opinion of ourselves. We have felt that our national ideals and aspirations spoke for themselves in the community of mankind. We are struck with a peculiar kind of nausea when we discover how many people there are in the world who believe we are all bathtubs, and automobiles, and skyscrapers, but without any moral purpose; that we are the New Carthage—all money but no spirit; that we are, in short, a country without a soul.

We know that is a myth. We know it is not true. It makes us angry and it brings out the chauvinist in us. We are resentful of this horrid misrepresentation. We would like to let all the ingrates who fall for this myth stew in their own juices, but we cannot. And we know we cannot. The orators talk about a "campaign of truth" to let the rest of the world know what we really are like, but what is "the truth"? Speeches? Statistics? Production figures? Thus far we have utterly failed to determine what it is we wish to communicate!

This is only a fraction of the case available to prove the most important point in our entire national history. We are on the razor edge of panic in this country. We have reached this precarious state of emotional instability because we are ringed about with the most desperate and complex problems we have ever been called upon to face. We are confronted with everything at once. We no sooner turn to face one problem than we are hit from behind by a dozen more. We have had no opportunity to go through a normal process of growth toward maturity in handling our international responsibilities. It has been thrust upon us in carload lots. Our cup of gall runneth over. Goodness and mercy are driven from our consciousness. We wallow in a welter of confusion and resentment, and the pattern of panic begins to emerge. Our political life dips to a new low. Witchhunts flourish. Character assassination prospers. Issues are fogged. Personalities prevail. People live from one sensation to another. We are witnesses to a strange and terrible sight in our midst.

The time has come for some of us to stand up and say this pattern of panic shall not prevail. America will not sacrifice its birthright of liberalism, objectivity, and freedom. It is one thing to feel the grip of panic in our innards, but it is quite another matter to give way to that feeling and lose all sense of contact with reality, no matter how harsh that reality may be.

This is an hour of destiny for America and for those principles of justice, opportunity, brotherhood, reason, and creative freedom which have dominated the minds of spiritually liberated men since the time of the Old Testament prophets.

Only by knowing what panic is can we hope to conquer and prevent it. Panic means contagious fear, alarm, and perplexity. It leads people into all kinds of wild and irrational behavior. It saps and destroys the very resources which enable people to stand firm and see their problems through. It softens people up so they can be led around like a herd. Panic is a primitive reaction to danger and frustration. The out-

lines of a pattern of panic have appeared in American life. Now, not later, is the time to stand firm against it. People who know what their rational purposes are, who understand the difficulties and disappointments they must face, who know there is no easy escape from responsibility—such people do not panic!

In the face of the present emotional state of affairs in America, it is the duty of every responsible person, and it is the special duty of the liberal church, to stand out as a shining example of calm, persistent fortitude, courage, objectivity, and faith.

There can come a point when panic is too far advanced to be stemmed even by the most steadfast example. That point has not been reached in America, and we can make sure there is enough rugged fibre in the American soul to insure against it ever being reached.

These are great days for religious liberals to be alive. These are days when the liberals should be feeling an almost prophetic sense of his place and function in the affairs of his fellow men. It is a time when, pushing theological scruples aside in favor of the drama which the moment requires, the liberal need not hesitate in voicing God's judgment upon a people which has the most golden opportunity of the ages to implement a world of creative human achievement and peace.

Do we Americans really believe in the unity of the human race? And do we really intend to put our enormous productive and organizing genius to the tasks of setting the peoples of Africa and Asia politically and economically free; and to deliver them from the segregation, discrimination, and humiliation which the Western world has thrust upon them for hundreds of years? As the ancient prophet would have phrased it: "God wants to know. Do we intend to do that, or do we not?"

Do we accept the marvellous, thrilling moral responsibility that goes with our supercharged scientific and technical genius, to walk, friendly fashion, into the chambers of the United Nations and say: "Work with us; we want to do everything it is within our power to do to help the working men and women of the entire world to feed, clothe, and house their families as well as the working men and women of the United States are able to do."?

Or do we intend to use this overwhelming power of ours merely to dominate and control the earth, and to suppress (for as long as we are able) all the insubordination, anxiety, and bitterness rising throughout the slums of the world?

These are the real questions which liberals, with prophetic persistence, must hold before the consciousness of their fellow Americans.

These are the questions which, like the judgment of an eternally just God, will bring forth ultimate answers; ultimate because they will surely determine the lot of mankind for generations to come.

What Should the Layman Expect of His Minister in These Times?

J. RAY SHUTE

If the layman is to be permitted to pan his parson, then I think it only fair to offer an opportunity of rebuttal. I wonder what the minister expects of the laymen in these times? As a matter of fact, if I may be so bold as to offer a suggestion, I think that all of us would do well not to be too expectant of the other fellow in times such as these in which we live—whether minister or layman. It is not so much the expected as it is the unexpected that differentiates this age from the one immediately preceding it. Doing the unexpected has verily come to be the expected thing, no less.

I suppose that all laymen expect a minister to justify his appellation and title: reverend and minister. He should be qualified both to revere and to minister. There are many values in life worthy of the former and many people today who are in desperate need of the latter. It might not be unwise to suggest that if we had more people in the world today who had the proper reverence for society and a willingness to minister to its needs, then we would not find ourselves at this moment cogitating on the best way to reject inoffensively the current invitation to a cosmic clambake and take our hadacol under our own bombproof vine and fig tree. But, alas, such is not the case.

A minister—just what *do* we expect of him? Surely we can ask ourselves this question only at the risk of sticking our lay necks out for the guillotine of clerical wrath. But, here goes! The ministry is a high calling. It is a dedicated and basic role in any age and amongst any people. It is not an easy job with union protection, wages, and hours. It is a calling in the same sense that the soldier hears the call for volunteers for a mission beyond the line of duty. No man has the moral right to enter the ministry and use it as an escape mechanism, as a financial undertaking, as a means of cheaply getting a higher education, as an opportunity for immunity, as a cover for other activities, or as a front. And it *has* been used for all of these purposes. It is *now* being used for all of these purposes. Each unfrocked traitor to the high calling of minister makes more difficult the task of those who take seriously their vows and duties. Hence, I would say that the layman would first expect honor from his minister. He would expect him to be loyal to his trust and to ply his bark upon life's turbulent stream with his true colors flying from the masthead. Furthermore, a good skipper never deserts his ship and a brave warrior never strikes his colors. There is no desertion from the ranks of honor save by those who have lost all sense of duty and direction. And may I add parenthetically that we liberals greatly err when we attempt to discredit the term: "called to the ministry." A man whose heart and conscience and mind have not been "called" to high service in the ministry to humanity had best remain out of this profession. Those who enter into

this calling without such a feeling are doomed to dissatisfaction. To me, the most to be pitied of all men is the minister who has no call to service. He is travelling on a fake pass; he is using counterfeit currency; he is an impersonator and an impostor. There is a tremendous difference between the pulpit and the soapbox; there is no similarity between the wine cup at the communion table and a short beer at the bar. Let us never, no never, forget: liberalism is not license, and freedom is only achieved, by minister and layman alike, through personal discipline.

Another thing I believe the average layman expects from his minister is loyalty. If a minister cannot be loyal to the tradition of his faith and to his church, then he should forsake both and not pose as a representative of that which he cannot tolerate and whose destiny is unsafe in his keeping. It is one thing to crusade for reform and quite another to betray one's trust. The world admires the gallant warrior under whatever flag he fights, but there are no monuments dedicated to the termite. The minister who would gamble the future of his church on one throw of the dice has odds so great against him that he cannot hope to win save in the exceptional case. He has no right to take such risks. We have learned through experience that compromise is not appeasement, and that permanent gains come slowly. Liberalism is itself a classic example of compromise and could not exist for a day without the application of this method. Of all people, liberals are the most uncomfortable in the presence of absolutism.

Still another thing we laymen admire in our ministers is courage. Even when we are taking a licking, we should do so like men and not like mice. When overwhelmed by a majority vote, we admire the courageous and intelligent minority report. Civilization may be defined as the adopting of minority reports. Progress is usually made as the result of the courageous and intelligent work of minorities; it seldom results from mass action. To stand for the right when thus to stand is unpopular is noble. We are to be thankful that such courage is in our tradition. This, I believe, is a hallmark of the liberal ministry. There is a suggestion, however, that might be indicated at this point. Courage should always be attended with discretion. Our forces are too small to be committed against odds that could wipe us out. This type of action ceases to be courageous and becomes foolhardy. It is the strategist who wins most battles, and he never permits himself to be drawn into traps where he can be annihilated.

The layman likes a minister who is understanding. All people are not alike—not even liberals. The minister who understands this and who can take people where they are and try to lead them forward will have a meaningful ministry. If we were to direct our activities only in terms of taking those who have already "arrived," then we would have little use for ministers. It is our chore to teach more and to preach less. Liberalism is an educational program and we have students in every grade. Ours is the function to assist all of these students to progress, knowing full well that all do not have the same preparation, aptitude, or ability to advance. After all, we *are* dealing with human beings and their reaction varies in almost equal proportion to the total number. They will never all arrive at the same point or at the same time. As a matter of fact, some will never "arrive" at all. Many will be lost on the way. The function of the minister, then, is not to serve as a one-man welcoming committee; he should serve as guide and leader. Liberalism seeks to develop attitudes, but, more important, it is the implementation of those attitudes in terms of active service that should constitute the constant concern of our clergy.

The layman respects the principle of the free pulpit, but he likewise expects the minister to respect and to preserve it. A pulpit is a church symbol and not an ideological springboard or a political stump. If it is to remain a symbol of freedom, of hope, and of consecration to noble ideals, then it should not be degraded or uprooted. The pulpit and the church wherein it stands are far more important than any single minister or any group of laymen who temporarily make use of it. The free pulpit and the liberal church have survival value far greater than the average individual human. There are times when this needs to be remembered. Freedom of the pews shares in importance with the freedom of the pulpit.

I believe the average layman admires a dedicated minister. That is to say, a minister who considers the welfare and progress of his parish his primary concern. Such a minister will not go afield seeking activities, associations, and interests to the neglect of the parish he is supposed to be serving. The layman realizes that wherever misery, suffering, injustice, oppression, and discrimination exist, there should the minister be found working his heart out to correct these evils. And, may I add, the layman should be at his minister's side. Whenever a church attempts to curtail such social action, then a situation is created whereby the minister becomes a nervous wreck. I believe most laymen want to see their ministers supporting all activities within the community and properly identified with all meritorious programs aimed at humanitarian service. On the other hand, the layman dislikes seeing his minister identified with groups which bring discredit upon both minister and church alike. It is the difference between the social cocktail party and a drunken brawl. We want our liberal ministers to be liberal, in the finest sense of that term. I do not believe that the average layman gets any more kick out of seeing his minister making a spectacle of himself than does the average minister when his parishioner "goes haywire."

And since we are letting our hair down, it might be just as well to mention that in a liberal congregation there is no small percentage of the laity therein whose education is quite as broad as the average minister's and these members have a rather difficult time listening to the cleric who so far forgets himself as to become dogmatic and authoritarian. It is just as easy to create an orthodoxy within liberalism as within fundamentalism. There is no position in either which is final or absolute. It is difficult to refrain from smiling at some of the views expressed by our younger ministers in economics and politics, whose theories are as familiar as their scholastic terms are novel. I think the average layman is quite liberal in his tolerant understanding of such matters and of such youngsters. Most of us have experienced similar incubation periods, even as most of us have weathered the urge to write poetry and to sail off to foreign ports. A good sense of humor is the best cold remedy for frigid climates, even as a mental catharsis is often indicated for stagnant thinking. If we will just refrain from taking ourselves too seriously, we will in all prob-

ability weather the storm of present-day tensions and frustrations. We are to be thankful for the microphone if for no other reason than the fact that shouting blasts the delicate instrument and interrupts communication. This assures us of well-modulated voices and, hence, a minimum of vocal explosions.

What should the layman expect of his minister in these times? Well, I should say that his expectations at this time should be no different from any other time. The layman and the minister differ primarily in location, not in quality or commitment. What I have indicated as desirable attributes for the minister are likewise desirable for the layman. A church can no more be built by the minister alone than by the laity alone. It is a joint undertaking. And when we shall have built a great church by coöperative effort, we shall find that we have likewise materially contributed to the building of a great community. Great communities, in turn, result in a great nation. For goodness and brotherhood, charity and mercy, education and progress are precious ingredients which can no more be restricted geographically than they can be hoarded for miserly satisfaction. They are as the sunlight, which is so everlastingly free that we cannot imprison it and make it a slave for any restricted use or time. Thus, too, is the liberal faith: it endures under whatever hardships it encounters. It is a sturdy plant in the garden of our culture; the winds of adversity may blow hard and cold against it, but it stands triumphant against the gale. The subversive currents may seek to undermine its rootage, but its foundations are secure. Fire and sword may cut down the outward stem but life continues beneath the surface, and springtime will see its growth continue anew. If our plant possesses such survival value, then be sure the garden of life shall never be denied its beneficent presence and beauty. And, forsooth, where bloom these beautiful flowers in such a garden, be sure that future cultivation and propagation shall not be denied through the absence of a gardener. Nature or God? What matter if the term be one or different, for either or both are but guaranties of man's glorious destiny.

Hence, I believe the average layman is little concerned with the theological thinking of his minister, so long as the minister has the welfare of the entire congregation at heart. A minister is the leader of *all* his parishioners: Humanists and theists, left and right wingers. All have the right to expect the same love and consideration from the minister. Perhaps the layman, as a rule, is more realistic about this than most ministers realize. In the final analysis, we must agree that we are prisoners of language and it is as ridiculous as it is immoral for us to become "hot and bothered" over the acceptance of one terminology as opposed to another. If we are honest, then, we must not permit our semantic dilemma to lead us into the same error that caused Judaism to kneel at etymological altars and become the most idolatrous of all religious sects. Ours must be a religion based on more substantial foundations than language. If we can but free ourselves from this yoke, then we can build a value system of endurance and reason, wherein moral and ethical commitments will not be subject to such constant revision and refinement due to the fluidity of language determinism. We must come to the ultimate realization that the methodology employed is of far more value than the temporary goal toward which we strive, for the simple reason that most goals involve abstractions and premises having validity primarily in terms of procedure rather than in scientific finality. Even this latter term has highly debatable connotations; if, indeed, the term itself is not anachronistic. What I am saying, in effect, is that the recent trend toward dichotomizing liberalism is as barren of reason as it is philologically ridiculous. And I am brutally frank when I say that I believe more laymen are conscious of this fact than most of our ministers realize. Moreover, if we think our denomination is unique in this respect, then for the sake of Auld Lang Syne take a look at the Congress of the United States!

For one, I do not want to see both democracy and religion degenerate into name-calling, labeling, semanticizing shadows of their once-great traditions. To make an impression on John Q. Public today it seems to be considered necessary only to scoop up shovels full of words and shower him therewith. Intelligent communication has so bogged down that it remains only a matter of time, no doubt, until we will require interpreters to make possible the communicating between Americans using the same mother tongue. The present trend could make a kindergarten study out of philosophy and place English grammar in the research laboratory. There are many who would consider this a practical adjustment now. In an age that produced atomic science, we must remember, a new psychic anthropology has also emerged! Our society surely resembles a zoological park, no less. We even guzzle alphabetical soup and munch animal crackers at the same time.

Out of the current confusion, however, there will emerge a new directive for meaningful living. I have every confidence that such will be true. We of the liberal faith do not lose hope easily; we have courage as of old. Our ministry is a combat team and can as readily attack problems of language splitting as our scientists did atom splitting. Our laymen, too, are enlisted in this fight. We accept gladly, yes proudly, the leadership of our sky pilots. What do we think of them? As a truth, the Unitarian layman thinks his parson is a swell guy!

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 86)

England accent seems close to the British. Japanese are not aware of the sectional dialects prevailing in the United States. Thus a G.I.'s extreme Brooklynese, "I wanna goil fren," puzzled many a Japanese hearer.

Apart from slang and colloquialisms, a Japanese can usually make himself understood in English. This may not be the case with a foreigner making a stab at Japanese. Japanese is complicated. For instance, one must master the "caste system," or honorifics. An honorific is expressed by pre-fixing an "o."

When one refers in Japanese to somebody else's wife, she is spoken of as *okusan,* which may be the equivalent of "madam." But one speaks of his own wife as *kanai* (literally, "within the house"); and *okusan* is not applied to all classes. Wives of shopkeepers, laborers, farmers, and those similarly situated are referred to as *okamisan.* The wife of a white-collar worker, however, is invariably addressed as *okusan.*

—*Worldover Press.*

Francis Ellingwood Abbot (1836-1903)

GARDNER WILLIAMS

From 1866 to about 1890 Dr. Francis Ellingwood Abbot was working effectively at very much the same sort of thing that Humanists are doing now. He was the leading figure in the Free Religious Association which was, in several ways, like the American Humanist Association. It was half inside and half outside the Unitarian denomination. Also it was dedicated to liberal religion; that is, to true religion without the traditional illusion and fraud.

Abbot was a pantheist, not a Humanist, but he was a wonder for his period in American culture. He wanted a church without any creed, in which ministers and members would be invited to believe what they thought was really true, and to say what they believed upon appropriate occasions. Moreover, the church might help supply the appropriate occasions. In the church as he conceived it, Humanists would have been welcome. The Unitarian Church today is as he wished it, liberal and creedless; and his labors contributed largely to making it so.

The time was when Unitarianism was not so liberal. At a Convention in New York City in 1865 it adopted a creed stating that Jesus of Nazareth was King, Lord, and Christ. In 1866, at the Unitarian Convention in Syracuse, Abbot was the leader of the radical faction seeking to have this abolished. He lost "the battle of Syracuse," but in 1867, in Boston, with several of his radical cronies, he founded the Free Religious Association to further the cause of liberalism. At the first public meeting Ralph Waldo Emerson was the first to sign up as a member and pay his dollar dues.

Until about 1890, under Abbot's leadership, the Association kept up a constant pressure on the American Unitarian Association by convincing many Unitarians that free religion was best. The Unitarian Association announced no change of policy, but gradually through these years its practice became more liberal. Several ministers were able to stay in the church and preach what was substantially Abbot's philosophy of religion. Prominent among these were W. J. Potter at New Bedford, Massachusetts, John Weiss at Watertown, Massachusetts, and Minot Savage, both in Boston and New York. They were tactful, whereas Abbot was always looking for trouble with the higher-ups as long as the denomination would not officially promulgate his principles exactly the way he stated them. His intransigence helped greatly to make the Unitarian Church a creedless sect in which the Humanist movement was able first to become articulate in 1920, and then to grow and to organize.

Abbot had a Unitarian Church in Dover, New Hampshire, 1864-1868. He tried to take it out of the denomination and make it an independent religious society. Instead, its more conservative members succeeded in removing him from Dover. In 1869 he was invited to become the minister in the Unitarian Church in Toledo, Ohio. He accepted on condition that it withdraw from the denomination and repudiate both Unitarianism and Christianity. It did so, calling itself the First Independent Society of Toledo. He was its minister until 1873 when it ceased to function. He was not a good preacher, and was unable to hold the membership. In 1870, in Toledo, he founded the *Index,* a liberal religious weekly magazine. He took it to Boston in 1873 and continued to edit it until 1880. This was one of his truly great achievements. But the task of financing it proved too much for him. The Free Religious Association ran it until 1886.

Abbot tried in vain to get a permanent teaching position in philosophy at Harvard and again at Cornell. He taught Josiah Royce's courses at Harvard for one year only (1887-1888) while Royce was abroad. Abbot's book, *The Way out of Agnosticism,* contains what he taught that year. Royce hated and despised him thereafter because of his divergence from Royce's brand of Hegelianism and because of his scientific emphasis. Abbot had some Emersonian mysticism and transcendentalism in him, but he also thought that most sound knowledge was based upon science.

His Fifty Affirmations, published repeatedly in the *Index,* summarized a good deal of his religious philosophy. The more important ones are:

1. Religion is the effort of man to perfect himself.
2. The root of religion is human nature.
18. Jesus probably stands at the head of all the great religious teachers of the past.
19. But he was unenlightened in claiming to be the Messiah.
33. Free Religion has been growing at the expense of Christianity.
37. The ideal of Free Religion is the perfection of man.
38. The means of Free Religion is education.
39. The great law of Free Religion is the still small voice of the private soul.
40. The great peace of Free Religion is spiritual oneness with the infinite One.
43. The cornerstone of Free Religion is faith in human nature.
44. The great institution of Free Religion is the coming Republic of the World, or Commonwealth of Man, the universal conscience and reason of mankind being its supreme organic law or constitution.
47. The spiritual ideal of Christianity is the suppression of self and the perfect imitation of Jesus, the Christ. The spiritual ideal of Free Religion is the free development of self.
50. Christianity is the faith of the soul's childhood; Free Religion is the faith of the soul's manhood. In the gradual growth of mankind out of Christianity into Free Religion lies the only hope of the spiritual perfection of the individual and the spiritual unity of the race.

Charles Darwin read these Affirmations and wrote Abbot that he agreed with them almost in their entirety (*Index,* Dec. 23, 1871, p. 404). Henry Ward Beecher wrote that he was surprised to see material of this nature, with which he did not at all agree, so well expressed (*Index,* April 13, 1872).

Abbot's chief book, *Scientific Theism* (1885), is an expansion of his Ph.D. thesis (Harvard 1881) and of a lecture which he delivered at the Concord School of Philosophy. It was translated into German in 1893. The American edition contains an excellent summary of his thought on pages 208-209. His book *The Syllogistic Philosophy* (1905) a very detailed account of his whole philosophy was posthumous.

Abbot's career suggests some further reflections. To be a successful Free Religionist minister in 1870 took special ability, just as it takes special ability today to be a successful Humanist minister. But today most Unitarian and Universalist ministers stand about where Abbot stood. They do not rely upon revelation or mir-

acles, they look beyond Christianity to find inspiration from all religions and from all philosophies, they seek a truly universal religion (see *Christian Register,* May 1950, p. 11), and they accept the main conclusions of science.

Whether or not the average liberal minister will preach Humanism successfully in the twenty-first century will depend upon the intellectual temper of the congregations. Ministers can do some things to educate their congregations, but many other factors enter in. One is economic prosperity. Another is the teaching and interpretation of science in the secular schools, both elementary and advanced. If Humanists want humanistic churches we shall have to tend to these other things as well. All of the aspects of human culture interact and are mutually interdependent.

The Study Table

Human Hope Still Deferred

SIGNS OF HOPE IN A CENTURY OF DESPAIR. *By Elton Trueblood. New York: Harper and Brothers. 125 pp. $1.00.*

It is the splendid purpose of this little book to face the tragedies and frustrations of our present age, "Half Past Nineteen Hundred," and then to look about for such resources of religious faith as are available to us. The first chapter does a splendid job of facing up. The remaining four chapters, not without important insights, betray the weakness of those who, like the author, are too greatly impressed with the magic phrase, *Ecumenical Christianity,* now so popular in evangelical circles.

The events of our present century are truly impressive. We, of middle age or more, have witnessed the coming of Russian Communism; we have seen the rise and decline of two fascist nations, Japan and Germany, and the reëmergence of Fascism in other countries. We have seen the liberation of India and the liquidation of the British Empire along with the humiliation of France. We have seen the birth and death of the League of Nations, and its resurrection in the United Nations. We have seen human suffering in disease, starvation, mass enslavement, and mass murder, known by that dread word *genocide.*

Here, then, is the setting for our common human fear, frustration, and despair. Where shall we look for sources of human hope? The author, a philosopher, points exclusively to the Christian way of salvation. And here is something to cause at least one reviewer to despair: Professor Trueblood refers to Whitehead's famous phrase characterizing the seventeenth century as "The Century of Genius." The men Whitehead specifically mentions are Locke, Spinoza, Francis Bacon, Kepler, Galileo, Descartes, Boyle, and others. Professor Trueblood also sees genius in our mid-twentieth century; and who are its representatives? Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Barth, Archbishop Temple, Emil Brunner, Paul Tillich, and Albert Schweitzer. One rubs one's eyes in amazement, and looks in vain for Gandhi, Dewey, Whitehead, and others, and one reflects how Whitehead's men of genius led the thinking of intelligent men out of Christian supernaturalism and orthodoxy, and how Trueblood's "geniuses" have deliberately pointed men back to a somewhat more palatable version of orthodoxy. Are we to assume that for religious insight the genius of this century is monopolized almost exclusively by neo-orthodoxy?

The author also sees great hope in what he calls "The Rise of the Horizontal Fellowship," the trend, in other words, to denominational mergers. The grander name for it is *Ecumenical Christianity.* The author does not even raise the question whether denominational mergers are primarily a practical recognition of the fact that theological differences of the past century are no longer important, or whether they are evidence of a new dynamism in Christian thinking and living. The latter is the assumption in this book, but one is moved to wonder. Certainly, in the matter of our proposed Universalist-Unitarian merger, no sponsor or committee in either denomination has yet claimed new insights for religious living, or a new dynamism. Some frankly fear the opposite; but the merger goes forward because there is no practical reason for refusing thus to combine our resources. Is it any different with evangelical Christianity?

The author, finally, sees great hope in the reëmergence of lay religion, and points to the Brethren, the Lollards, the Quakers, the Society of Jesus, and other historic Christian groups as examples. It is indeed possible that we shall find in our own Unitarian household a dynamic force in the eighty or more fellowships, more often than not, lay-inspired and lay-led. Moreover, it is no secret that the strength of Communism, as a grass-roots movement, lies in the utter devotion and dependability of the individuals and cells—tiny nuclei of activity and leadership in a morass of opposition. But once again this reviewer demurs when the Buchmanite fellowship in Calvary Church, New York, is pointed to as an outstanding example of a twentieth century "Redemptive Fellowship."

This book is one of too many, recently published, which so rigidly confines themselves to Christian resources refusing thereby to see religious insights—and hope—in the many human and secular possibilities entirely apart from Christian tradition or supernaturalism. Some day, let us hope,—some far-off day—some outstanding Christian leader will see this, and understand it, and proclaim it. Meanwhile "the signs of hope" herein proclaimed leave much still unsaid, and many sources of great hope still completely unexplored.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

A Valuable Source Book

BUDDHISM. *By Edward Conze. New York: Philosophical Library. 212 pp., plus index. $6.00.*

Americans are well aware that Christianity is not one, but a sometimes bewildering variety of groups and sects, some of which are basically different from others. Buddhism, also, is not one, but a variety of groups and movements. Mr. Conze endeavors to indicate some of the main movements, and something of their historical background. For those who seek such specialized information and knowledge, it is a valuable source.

SYLVANUS M. DUVALL.

Western Unitarian Conference

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

NOMINATING COMMITTEE

The Board of Directors of the Western Unitarian Conference elected the following persons to the Nominating Committee:

John W. Cyrus, Chairman, Omaha, Nebraska.
William Newberry, Alton, Illinois.
Mrs. D. Gilman Taylor, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

This committee will report to the annual meeting in May, and place in nomination three persons to serve on the Board of Directors for terms of four years. The retiring members of the Board are Lee M. Burkey, Chicago; Mrs. Harry Burns, Cincinnati; and John W. Cyrus. The committee invites your suggestions.

CENTENNIAL MEETINGS

The Western Unitarian Conference will celebrate its One-Hundredth Anniversary May 2-4, 1952, at Cincinnati, Ohio. The Conference was organized in Cincinnati in May, 1852. The headquarters will be at the Hotel Alms. An excellent program is being prepared. Among those contributing to it are Dr. Frederick May Eliot, President of the American Unitarian Association; Dr. A. Powell Davies, Minister of the Unitarian Church in Washington, D. C.; Dr. Charles H. Lyttle, Conference Historian and author of the history of the Conference; Rev. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., Rockford, Illinois; and Rev. Aron Gilmartin, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Reservations for hospitality, either at the hotel or in homes, should be made with Mrs. Oscar Quimby, 3129 Penrose Place, Cincinnati 11, Ohio.

MINISTER'S INSTITUTE

The Western Conference Branch of the Unitarian Ministers' Association will hold its Institute as a pre-session of the Conference Centennial. The meetings will begin with supper, Wednesday, April 30, 1952, at the Hotel Alms. It is hoped that all the ministers of the Conference will attend. An outstanding and stimulating program has been prepared. Reservations for the Institute can be made through Rev. Julius Krolfifer, 449 Fairview Place, Cincinnati 19, Ohio.

BY-LAW REVISION

One of the major items of business at the Conference Centennial will be the adoption of a new set of By-laws. The By-law Revision Committee has mailed copies of the proposed changes and alternatives to all the churches. It is hoped that careful consideration will be given to them and that the questionnaire attached will be filled out and sent to the chairman of the committee, Mr. David Connolly, Rockford, Illinois. This will aid the committee in presenting the By-laws in as simplified a version as possible.

AREA ORGANIZATIONS

At the Annual Meeting in Evanston last April the Conference voted to encourage the establishment of sub-regional area organizations. Three already are functioning: the Iowa Unitarian Association, The Minnesota Unitarian Conference, and the Michigan Area Unitarian Council. Three others are in the process of being established. The Ohio Valley Unitarian Conference held an initial organizing meeting at Louisville, Kentucky, January 11 and 12, 1952. A Steering Committee was appointed with Rev. Ellsworth Smith, First Church, Cincinnati, Ohio, as chairman. The Central Illinois or probably the Abe Lincoln Conference will hold an organizational meeting in Bloomington, Illinois, April 4 and 5, 1952. Plans are under way to constitute the Midwest Council of Religious Liberals, an organization of Unitarian and Universalist churches in the greater Chicago area, as a sub-region.

The Conference Planning Committee which is composed of representatives from the sub-regions and the Board of the Conference will submit to these area organizations a correlated schedule for their annual meetings in the Fall and a project in which all may share.

APPEAL SEMINARS

Three seminars or workshops on Appeal methods and techniques were held during January. Mr. O. T. Gilmore, Director of the United Unitarian Appeal, Boston, and the Secretary of the Conference were the resource leaders. The meetings were held in Louisville, Kentucky, for the Ohio Valley Conference, on January 12; at Chicago on January 13; and in Detroit, January 19. More than twenty churches and fellowships participated.

CHICAGO—U. S. C.

The Chicago Area Committee of the Unitarian Service Committee raised $16,000 in its Fall campaign. This represents an approximate 50 per cent increase over last year. Of special interest is the fact that while large contributions fell off greatly, the number of contributors nearly doubled. This was true throughout the country for Service Committee campaigns. The Unitarian Service Committee set a goal of $285,000 for 1951 and it succeeded in raising, not counting special grants from foundations, some $320,000.

NEW FELLOWSHIPS

Two new Fellowships have been organized within the Conference and have applied for recognition. They are located in Jamestown, North Dakota; and Park Forest, Illinois.

ELLEN CONNOLLY

Ellen Connolly, 86, wife of Dr. Charles Parker Connolly, Minister Emeritus of the Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois, died Thursday, January 17th, in Rockford. She is survived by her husband; a daughter, Mrs. Paul Caskey, a former member of the Board of the Western Conference; and a son, C. David Connolly, Chairman of the By-law Revision Committee of the Conference and Chairman of the Business Committee of the American Unitarian Association. Jack Mendelsohn, Jr., minister of the Rockford church, said of her: "She wrested from life its innermost secrets. The blessings of long and fruitful years. The homage of uncounted friends. . . . For her the crown of life was set with its most precious jewels. Its radiance remains, reflected and treasured in our memory."

GENEVA

It is not too early to begin planning for Geneva. The dates—June 29 to July 5. Registration fee, $5.00. Send it to Mrs. Esther L. Heinrich, 629 So. Grove St., Oak Park, Illinois.

ST. LOUIS

A workshop on group methods and techniques was held in St. Louis, January 19 and 20. Mr. Malcolm Knowles, Executive Director of the Adult Education Association, was the resource leader. Members from the church in Alton, Illinois, also participated.

GROSSE POINTE

The annual fair of the Grosse Pointe Unitarian Church was held just before Christmas. It netted nearly $3,000. Comments of the members of the church indicate that it was not only a financial success but that the cooperative adventure also contributed greatly to the fellowship and *esprit de corps* of the congregation.

BLOOMINGTON

In Bloomington, Illinois, the annual fair of the Unitarian church is one of the major events in the life of the city. It is an all-church project. Not only is it a gala social event but it is also very profitable, as the $2,000 receipts clearly indicate.

LOUISVILLE, FIRST CHURCH

Rev. Robert T. Weston, minister of the First Unitarian Church of Louisville, has been ill as the result of an infection contracted in the South Pacific while serving as a chaplain in the Navy. For part of December and the month of January he has been recuperating in Fairhope, Alabama, on Mobile Bay. He expects to return to his pulpit some time in February. Rev. John Isom has been filling the pulpit during Mr. Weston's absence. Mr. Isom has been granted preliminary fellowship in the Unitarian ministry.

OMAHA

Some time during February or March the new Religious Education building of the Omaha church will be dedicated. A miracle of sorts has been accomplished in that through expert and careful supervision the building is being completed with a savings of several thousand dollars under the original estimated cost.

MADISON

Rev. Fred I. Cairns, minister of the Madison Church during the time it erected its new Frank Lloyd Wright building, resigned in December to accept the pulpit of the new Unitarian church in Hamilton, Ontario. He began his work in Hamilton in the middle of January. The pulpit committee of Madison is now in the process of seeking a new minister. In the meantime, the pulpit is being filled by various members of the church and the faculty of the University of Wisconsin.

DETROIT

The High School and Junior High School young people of the Detroit Unitarian-Universalist church will visit the First Unitarian Church of Chicago, the University of Chicago, and Abraham Lincoln Centre in Chicago some time in March.

FREE RELIGIOUS FELLOWSHIP—CHICAGO

Dr. Thaddeus B. Clark was guest preacher at the Free Religious Fellowship on Sunday, January 20. The Fellowship is planning to undertake a survey of its four years of existence for the purpose of being better able to determine its future course.

IOWA CITY

Just before Christmas the furnace in the Iowa City church gave out. It has been replaced with a new oil burner. They have also redecorated the auditorium.

SHELBYVILLE, ILLINOIS

Mr. Allen Dampman, a student at Meadville Theological School, has been engaged to conduct the services at Shelbyville for the remainder of the year. For the past few years they have been having services once a month with preachers from Chicago and other nearby cities. This will enable them to hold services more frequently and return to a pattern followed for many years of using Meadville students.

LINCOLN, NEBRASKA

The kitchen in the Lincoln Church has been remodeled and streamlined. The editor of the *Lincoln Unitarian* comments that it is easier to be a Christian on a full stomach and that he looks for an improvement in the religious observances on the part of the congregation.

IMPERSONATORS

At least two ministers in the Conference have been visited recently by impersonators who know the Unitarian organization thoroughly. Whether it was the same one in both cases is not known. However, the one that visited Dr. Pullman in Detroit was caught recently in Washington, D. C. He went under the name of Frederick Emerson Peters and was on the F.B.I.'s list of the ten most wanted criminals according to a clipping from a Detroit paper. At the time of his arrest he gave his name as Paul Carpenter. Ministers are advised not to cash checks for strangers no matter how well they appear to know the Unitarian organization or its officials.

A NEW CHURCH

The South Bend, Indiana, Fellowship more than doubled the number of families in its membership between October 1 and January 13. It expects to meet the requirements for recognition as a church by the time of the February meeting of the Board of the American Unitarian Association. The progress which this group has made under the leadership of the Minister, Rev. Erwin Gaede, is most exciting. The chairman of the group, Mr. Rowland Sylvester, reports that they are looking for a lot to which they can move a building available to them.

ORDER HISTORY NOW

It is hoped that the new history of the Western Unitarian Conference will be off the press by the time of the Centennial meetings. It is not certain that it will but every effort will be made to make it possible. Church book tables and persons desiring copies should order them now from the Conference Office to be sure of prompt and early delivery.

THANKS FROM G., G., AND R.

It is difficult to say thanks to anonymous benefactors but the Hiltons—Gladys, Gaynor, and Randall—want their many friends in the Conference to know that they deeply appreciate the most thoughtful and generous Christmas and New Year's presents. It was a complete surprise. Many, many thanks.

CENTENNIAL MEETINGS—Hotel Alms—Cincinnati, Ohio
May 2-4, 1952